UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,501	12/11/2001	Kerry Champion	23982-11568	6519

758   7590   08/24/2007
FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/015,501	CHAMPION, KERRY
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Adnan M. Mirza	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 September 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gourraud

(200200226473) and further in view of Arteaga et al (U.S. 2002/0161826).

As per claims 1,17,33,41-42,53-54,56 Gourraud disclosed traffic manager for facilitating

communication between a client node and a server node in a distributed computing environment

in accordance with at least one policy, the server node having a first interface associated

therewith (Page. 5, Paragraph. 0054), the traffic manager capable of communicating with both

the client code and the server node and comprising a central processing unit which is operable to:

communicate with the server node via the first interface, generate and publish at least a second

interface for the first interface, in accordance with said at least one policy (Page. 4, Paragraph

0042).

However Gourraud did not disclose in detail communicate with the client node via the second

interface, thereby allowing the client node to access at least one service on the server node in

accordance with the at least one policy.

In the same field of endeavor Arteaga disclosed, If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object (Page. 8, Paragraph. 0116).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object as taught by Arteaga in the method of Gourraud to provide a practical way for user communication devices to carry out real-time transactions and communications on such devices and processing of such transactions with a remote source such as an enterprise network server.

3.   As per claims 2,18,34,43,55 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first and second interfaces comprises Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

4.   As per claims 3,19 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the SOAP interfaces employ Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

5.   As per claims 4,20,35 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein each of the first and second

interfaces has a description language file associated therewith defining the associated interface

(Gourraud, Page. 8, Paragraph. 0076).

6.   As per claims 5,21,36 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first interface corresponds

to one of HTTP, TCP, HTTPS, HTTPR, and MQ (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0071).

7.   As per claims 6,22 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing

environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise including the server node,

and wherein the client node is external to the network (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0071).

8.   As per claims 7,23 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing

environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise and including both the

client and server nodes (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0066).

9.   As per claims 8,24,40,44 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy

includes requiring authorization by a human operator for invocation of the at least one service

(Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

10.   As per claims 9,25,41,45 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy

includes 5 mapping an organizational role to a person (Arteaga, Page. 8, Paragraph. 0114).

11.   As per claims 10,26,46 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the mapping of the

organizational role to the person is done using an LDAP directory associated with the distributed

computing environment (Arteaga, Page. 4, Paragraph. 0060).

12.   As per claims 11,27,37,47 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is

a security policy (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

13.   As per claims 12,28,48 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is

associated with encryption or decryption of at least a portion of data which is exchanged between

the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

14.   As per claims 13,29,49 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is

associated with generating or verifying at least one digital signature for at least one portion of

data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

15.   As per claims 14,30,38,50 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is

associated with protection against service attacks (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

16.   As per claims 15,31,39,51 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is

associated with enforcing policies with respect to publication or access to the first or second

interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

17.   As per claims 16,32,40,52 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is

associated with review of data communicated between the server and client nodes (Gourraud,

Page. 5, Paragraph. 0043).

18.   As per claim 54 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed a computer-implemented method for

facilitating communication between server and client programs, the method comprising:

reading a WSDL file associated with a first SOAP interface to at least one server program

(Gourraud, Page. 5, Paragraph. 0052); and generating or publishing at least a second SOAP

interface corresponding to the first SOAP interface in accordance with at least one policy;

wherein at least one client program can use the second SOAP interface to request one or more

services (Arteaga, Page. 1, Paragraph. 0009).

19.   As per claim 55 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the method further comprises:

reading a first UDDI file which lists the first SOAP interface; generating or publishing a second

WSDL file which describes the second SOAP interface; and creating or updating at least one

UDDI entry associated with the generated or published WSDL file (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph.

0095).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to applicant's arguments is as follows. Claims 54 and 55 have been addressed.

20.   Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose, "Generating or publishing a second

interface in accordance with at lest one policy for communication between a client and a server

node. It should also be noted that the second interface that can be used to communicate with a

server node.

As to applicant's argument, Arteaga disclosed, "The client device can establish a local or

network connection with a web server through a data transfer protocol (Page. 3, Paragraph

0056). A SOAP envelop is preferably securely communicated from client device to the network

web-server preferably via HTTPS. Within the network operating system the SOAP enveloped

transaction is passed from the network web server to resource connector interfaced with SOAP

parser (Page.12, Paragraph. 0157).

21.   Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose, "Traffic manager that can communicate

with both the client and server node".

As to applicant's argument Arteaga disclosed, "Network web server 700 delivers applications, version updates, and necessary components via transfer protocol to a client device (Page. 6, Paragraph. 0090).

22.   Applicant argued that examiner has not established a prima case of obviousness as a motivation or suggestion for combining Gourraud and Arteaga et al.

As to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Arteaga in the method of Gourraud to provide a practical way for user communication devices to carry out real-time transactions and communications on such devices and processing of such transactions with a remote source such as an enterprise network server.

Conclusion

23.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner

should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

24.   The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business

hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-

746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

25.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for un published

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

Adnan Mirza

Examiner

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER